

Social Responsibility

MOST REV. JOHN G. MURRAY

Sermon preached by the Archbishop of St. Paul at the Pontifical Mass opening the Eighty-second Annual Convention of the Catholic Central Verein and the Twenty-first of the National Catholic Women's Union at Hartford, Conn., August 15, 1937.

*Reprinted from the Catholic Transcript,
August 19, 1937.*

WHILE everyone may be disposed to admit that man is a social being as well as an individual with certain inherent rights given him by God, yet not everyone will agree that man has responsibilities to society as essential to the welfare of his fellow man as to himself. Not everyone is ready to place the second part of the commandment of love on the same basis as the first. When we accept the code of love established by the Son of God in the great commandment: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God and thy neighbor as thyself," most of us look upon the second part as a mere appendage or addendum to the first and fail to realize that both are so involved in the relationship of man to God and man to man that they are inseparable. The love of God cannot be divorced from the love of man and the love of man must not be divorced from the love of God. The question asked by Cain the murderer at the dawn of creation: "Am I my brother's keeper?" will be answered by the Son of God on the day of judgment in the terms that have already been recorded in the book of gospels: "Amen I say to you as long as you did it to one of these My least brethren, you did it to Me" (Matt. xxv. 40).

This sense of social responsibility is so completely interwoven with the destiny and the duties of each unit of human society that the repudiation or the neglect of such responsibility leads to the destruction of each such unit of society and ultimately implies the destruction of society itself.

In the family which is the essential unit of society and antecedent to any other unit of society with rights and responsibilities independent of any other unity of society is found the sphere wherein the primary and most necessary

process of education for personal character and social relationship should be developed. And yet in our day and generation the family has repudiated its responsibilities for this most essential type of education on the plea that either the State or the Church is discharging the function of education. Now the State is concerned with education only in so far as its own existence may be safeguarded by the dissemination of knowledge necessary to enable the citizens of the State to fulfill their responsibilities to the State. Thus in abdicating its own function of education the family repudiates its sense of responsibility for the perpetuation of its own existence and the protection of its own welfare. The result will be the ultimate disappearance of the State through the cessation of the essential unit of the State which is the family. While the family may look to the State for guidance in the principles and doctrines essential to the development of citizenship in time and in eternity, yet the application of those principles must be made in the life of the home which was established by God as the source of all life and elevated by sacramental grace to a sphere in which the sense of social responsibility might be fostered to perfection in the observance of the twofold commandment of the love of God and neighbor. If the family declines to perform its duties in the field of education it not only brings catastrophe upon itself but upon both Church and State whose life can never be stronger or more enduring than the life of the family which is the essential unit of both Church and State.

From the home must spring whatever elements are essential to the life of the individual and of society. But the home can give only what it has received. If there is lack of culture, lack of character and lack of social responsibility in the home, ways and means must be discovered and applied to effect the reconstruction of the home. The worldwide vision of the Shepherd of Christendom revealed an appalling deficiency of the qualifications required for the adequate discharge of cultural and social responsibilities within the home. In our day the home fails to develop a society conscious of its ultimate destiny and equipped with the economic and social apparatus essential to the attainment of its destiny. As a preliminary to the Christian renewal of human society the Holy Father demands a rationalization in the reorganization of social economy which will reconstruct

the home as the essential unit in human society and make possible the new social order leading to a reformation of morals and a Christianization of the entire social structure.

Such a program is possible only if social units such as those composing the Catholic Central Verein of America and the National Catholic Women's Union are multiplied throughout the world until every adult man and woman is educated to the realization of the social responsibilities of every member of society. Such education must lead to the all-pervading conviction in the soul of every member of the human race that each is born not to himself alone but to God and to society, that each is to live not to himself alone but to God and for his fellow man, that each is called vocationally to the discharge of a duty that is essential to the perpetuity and perfection of the entire social structure, that each holds a place of honor and dignity in the development of the kingdom of God among the children of men and that by the faithful discharge of his duties in his own particular sphere each qualifies himself for esteemed citizenship among men and angels.

A mere philosophical appreciation of the opportunities and responsibilities of each in the field of human existence and human society will not suffice to stimulate each to a sustained effort to adjust his relations to all men on the basis of social justice. There is need of the good will of which the angels sang at the birth of Christ. Only through the good will of men begotten of the good will of God to men will man find the incentive to undertake the discharge of his social responsibilities in serving his fellow man as the obvious and tangible process of service to God.

Even when man has undertaken the task that is his by virtue of his social nature he will encounter such overwhelming odds in the incessant conflict of interests involved in the economic, educational, social and even religious world, that he may falter and be tempted to surrender to the blind drift of society away from its moorings and away from the only haven in which it can find security.

Man may be maneuvered into a position where he will be strongly tempted to substitute competition for cooperation, envy for liberality, greed for generosity, hatred for good will, war for peace. In fact the inheritance which he has received from the traditions of many generations in soci-

ology as in commerce, in economics as in industry, in education as in religion, disposes him to seek a competitive objective for his personal advancement through the elimination or annihilation of others in the field. So confusing has been the state of the world that men seek the evil cause of disaster in the forms of social relationship itself rather than in the malice of those who have exploited and perverted those forms to the detriment of society. Extremes of revolution are suggested by various groups in the field of government in order to find a newer and better way of social development.

No change of external forms in human society will effect a change in the souls of man who may pervert the best of forms to the destruction of man and society. Even the ideals suggested by the Vicar of Christ and the realization of the new social order which he outlines will avail little unless the souls of men are attuned to the heavenly harmony of the angelic choir which announced peace on earth. It is the essence of the divine life which can alone give action, movement and performance to any order of social existence. Paganism can pervert any order as it can pervert any soul.

But because millions may have lapsed into paganism or near-paganism is no cause for dismay in the hearts of those who gird themselves for the service of God and society. "With the assistance of divine grace the destiny of the human family lies in our hands." Such is the slogan given us by the spiritual leader who has summoned us to the divine cause of human salvation.

The Church is the universal Mother who can never permit herself to resent persecution, revenge wrong or fight her children even though she may discipline them and correct their errors. Every human being purchased by the blood of Christ is the offspring of His spouse. As a mother she must not only gather to her heart the children who have strayed from her and disowned her but also the children who have never acknowledged her and the children who curse her today as did the children of the past. While the Church champions social justice she participates in the divine nature of her Blessed Founder in preaching and dispensing love that the malice of men may be dissipated as mist before the rising sun. No natural sentiment of love is adequate to endure the test as no human sympathy is sufficient to sustain

the courage of either her or any of her leaders in the conflict through which each must pass in the course of earthly existence and earthly experience.

Only the charity of God—and God, says the Beloved Disciple, is charity—can enable each of us to meet the challenge given to each in the mandate of her supreme head. "In order to bring back to Christ these whole classes of men who have denied Him, we must gather and train from amongst their very ranks auxiliary soldiers of the Church, men who know their mentality and their aspirations, and who with kindly fraternal charity will be able to win their hearts. The world has nowadays sore need of valiant soldiers of Christ, who strain every thew and sinew to preserve the human family from the dire havoc which will befall it were the teachings of the gospel to be flouted and a social order permitted to prevail which spurns no less the laws of nature than those of God. For herself the Church of Christ, built upon the solid rock, has nothing to fear, for she knows that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her (Matt. xvi. 18); and the experience of centuries has taught her that storms, even the most violent, pass, leaving her stronger and triumphantly victorious. But her maternal bosom cannot but be stirred at the thought of the countless ills which tempests of the kind occasion to so many thousands; at the thought above all, of the immense spiritual evils which would ensue, entailing the eternal ruin of so many souls redeemed by the blood of Christ."

May the deliberations of this convention illumine the course of your future activities! May the grace of God sanctify and support each of you in the consecration of self to the cause of the Christianization of the world! May the companionship of the Son of God console each of you in the dark hours as in the bright! May the participation of each of you in the life of God qualify each for the fullest measure of heavenly citizenship in His kingdom for time and for eternity!

The Retreatant

RT. REV. MSGR. AUGUSTINE F. HICKEY

A Paper Read at the Second National Conference of the Laywomen's Retreat Movement, Boston, Mass., July 3, 1937.

THE retreatant, disposed to make a retreat, sets out on a silent road which leads to light and strength. The adventure, short and intense, is made alone. The loneliness is not oppressive for it is not absolute. There is no real loneliness, for the retreatant's companionship is with God, ever present and during retreat more present than ever. The retreatant's mind during retreat surrenders all interest, attention and activity to the truths and to the gifts of God. God becomes the all-consuming concern of the retreatant's soul.

Any woman with opportunity and good will can and should be a retreatant. The saint, the sinner; the fearful, the contented; the enthusiastic, the indifferent; all types and temperaments make fitting subject-matter for the influence of a retreat. Unfortunately the opportunity is not opened to all. Home or business or professional responsibilities frequently obstruct the use of the exercises of a retreat. Whenever the opportunity is open, neglect is a deplorable misfortune. Happily the number of women to whom a retreat is a possibility is unquestionably large. Young women of high school and college age with those not far advanced in family or wage earning obligations constitute the groups from which retreatants can be recruited with least resistance and difficulty.

Resistance to the idea of becoming a retreatant arises from a lack of sense of need. Leaders and advocates of the retreat movement must be prepared to set forth in word and example the singular advantages of the retreat to the retreatant. A hope and a promise of actual and permanent profit must have place in the mind of the retreatant before one can expect much interest or cooperation in the project.

Is there something worth while in a retreat for a retreatant? Does the prospective retreatant need a retreat?

Is this unique exercise of prayer and self-discipline an actual advantage to a woman's soul? It is the purpose of this brief discussion to answer these questions definitely in the affirmative. We have spoken of light and strength as the end of the road for the earnest retreatant. In retreat the eternal truths of revealed religion reassert themselves in the brilliance of an undimmed and discerning faith. God's presence and protection become actual. In the life of the retreatant the divine realities are now more real.

Catholics as a group are familiar by name and definition with the fundamental truths of revealed religion. Religion has been taught and learned in practically every Catholic life. But learning must be measured in degrees, not the academic kind but in the degrees of the effect the learning produces in the individual's thought and conduct. The retreatant enters a retreat really to learn. She becomes a pupil in a somewhat strange school where distraction is minimized and attention fixed with unusual vigilance. The demands of family and business interests go unheeded for the moment. Every particle of spiritual and intellectual energy is centered on the fresh acquisition and more complete assimilation of God's truth in its relation to the retreatant's immortal soul. Souls differ in their depths according to the things that are real to them. The honest retreatant grows necessarily in her comprehension of the reality of the supernatural and the unseen. This advance is the natural result of sustained and humble reflection. At the same time, because God is its object, this reflection is of the essence of prayer.

The mind in worthwhile meditation stands at the beginning of all good. Faith seeks understanding constantly. Thus the eager retreatant is engaged first of all in the study of religious truth. The overwhelming reality of God and of God's infinite justness and goodness assumes new importance and power in the consciousness of the retreatant. How can one become more aware of God? It is Our Lord, the Incarnate God who is the Way, Truth and Life. His person, His character, His example are mighty in the measure in which they are studied. The retreatant studies Our Lord as she reflects and prays. How is His mission perpetuated among us? His historical existence is the center of all human history spreading indescribable meaning and beauty on

the past. Now it is the Church which preserves for us and presents to us the truth, the influence, the grace of Our Lord and Our Brother, human in nature, divine in nature and in person. Through the ceaseless action of the Holy Spirit of God the supernatural wonders of the Incarnation are ours to the exalted point that we are called and we are the children of God.

The words, *God, Our Lord, Redemption, Church, Grace*, are familiar to the retreatant, but how vivid or how real are the ideas these words convey? The tragedy of much Christian living is found in the fact that things of sense, the hopes and ambitions of earth are the dominating realities, while the truths of God are vague, colorless, ineffective in character and conduct. What can be done about it? Let Catholic women become retreatants. Let them go to school in the spiritual environment of a convent and in two or three days intensify their grasp on the realities of God.

A clarified and cogent faith is only the first step in the progress of the retreatant. The great objective is a closer personal union with God. A strong faith produces active love. The will of man follows his understanding. Resolution is the offspring of reflection. Through the prayer of reflection the retreatant finds God so near, so gentle, so generous that the soul's attraction is at once genuine and fervid. Repentance replaces sin, doubts are turned to certainties; dissatisfactions disappear in the glow of the peace of God. The retreatant in mind and will and soul comes forth a new creature. For God is never outdone in generosity. Whatever the retreatant offers in the industry of reflection and in the sincerity of love is repaid in unstinted gifts of divine grace. God invariably makes return for the feeblest movement of His children towards Himself.

The retreatant, now a new creature, comes forth with her outlook on life rectified and elevated. Religion is no longer one of the many activities of life. It is life. It embraces and includes every form of work and play, of suffering and joy. Whatever is done is to be done in the name of Our Lord. The humblest tasks of the kitchen, the drudgery of the factory or the office take on new fascination and beauty, for they are acts of religion, of sacrifice and of the love of God. The reality of divine truth made more actual by study and reflection and the grace of God together pro-

duce a peace of soul and power of achievement hitherto unknown to the life of the retreatant. In new understanding and revived spirit she returns to take up cheerfully the duties of her station.

More than this, there should grow in the retreatant a new attitude towards the mission and the life of the Church. Out of her reflection comes a holier concept of her high dignity and her responsible privilege as a member of Our Lord's Body, which is His Church. New loyalty and zeal for the progress of the works of the Church in teaching and sanctifying mankind are the natural and supernatural effects of the retreatant's experience. What return shall I make to the Lord for all that He has given to me? Good is always self-diffusive. The retreatant now good because so close to God, is impatient to help others make progress in goodness.

Where and how can she begin? Where is the Church to be found? It is not far to seek. Every Catholic parish is the Catholic Church in miniature. There the authority, teaching office and sanctifying power are present and active. If a retreatant would do something for the Church let her spiritual interests be centered in her own parish. There by word and example she can accomplish much. Her interest in the devotional life of the parish will be an edifying example to others. Her presence at the parish mission, the Sodality, the special devotions, her attitude of method of prayer during Mass on Sundays and on occasional week days, her frequent reception of Holy Communion, all these are profitable lessons to those who pray perhaps less than she. This intimate active association with the spiritual life of the parish should be easy and natural to the retreatant. One's conscious and deliberate efforts to influence others are sometimes ineffective. It is the unconscious influence of simple and virtuous conduct which produces worthy effect in any neighborhood. The retreatant must find expression for her new and higher life by willing and cheerful participation in the life of the parish, for parish life is, for the individual Catholic, the life of the Church.

Participation in parish life is to be extended to activities not exclusively devotional. It is the responsibilities of the modern parish to provide educational and social opportunities for growth and development in more perfect Chris-

tian living. Where shall parish priests look for leadership in these activities if not among those who have come to some finer understanding and appreciation of the Christian life and of the Christian's obligation to help his neighbor? Retreatants should be ready to furnish such leadership. Every retreatant is not a born leader but every retreatant should be ready with good will.

Parish life needs the intelligent cooperation of laywomen in the great variety of activities which have place in the fulfilment of the mission of the Church. In organization for the material and spiritual needs of the poor, in groups coming together for study and intellectual improvement, in social clubs for profitable recreation, women of intelligent faith and balanced zeal are constantly in demand. Where shall we recruit membership for the Legion of Mary or the Sewing Guild? Where shall we find leadership and direction for Book Club, the Braille Club, the Girls' Club, the Scout Troops and for work among less fortunate children who sadly need instruction and sympathy? We must express our faith and love in these channels if we are not to leave undone the tasks Our Lord has given us to do. A retreatant with clear faith and strong love should be the first to volunteer and to give of herself gladly according to her capacity in the corporal and spiritual works of mercy of the parish. By these works a Catholic parish lives and thrives.

Catholic life can never be considered an exclusively personal matter. As human beings we are born into a family; as Catholics we are baptized into the life of Our Lord's Church at a parish baptismal font. By baptism we become members of a living Body. This Body is ever active in the very neighborhood where we find our homes. To know one's home is to know one's parish. Family devotion finds expression in the home. Devotion to the larger life of the family of God is devotion to the life of the parish. In the parish family work with the young. The young are ready for impressions wholesome and stimulating. They take these easily from lives animated with faith and genuine love of God. To influence young lives for good is a high privilege of the retreatant.

This conference is called to spread and encourage the retreat movement among Catholic women. It is the ob-

vious thing to say that a retreat is a source of renewed divine life in the retreatant. Can this statement be proven? Yes, when this life manifests itself in action where action is needed. Retreatants must give evidence in their parishes of the benefits and advantages of a retreat. Then will the retreat movement come to enjoy the esteem and the influence it so honestly merits.

Let us be convinced ourselves of the personal and social value of the retreat to the retreatant. Let us express this conviction by our manner of living in the Church, which means in the parish. Doing these things well, we fulfil our duties to Our Lord and to the Church; we make manifest our appreciation and gratitude for the privilege of the retreat; we move others to follow on the road of the retreatant. This holy road leads to light and strength in God.

The Orthodox Eastern Church

DONALD ATTWATER

Reprinted from the Month (London) in the issue of June, 1937.

VERY notable in the past twenty years has been the increase of interest (due not a little to the Holy See) in Eastern Orthodoxy and the revival of religion in the Orthodox Churches. The name "Eastern Orthodox" is given to those Christians who, preserving valid orders and sacraments and the fundamental truths of faith and morals, have ceased (except for two very short periods) to be in communion with the Holy See since the schism of the Church of Constantinople in 1054. They form the second largest homogeneous body of Christians and nominally number 150,000,000 (which includes a majority of the unhappy people of Russia). It appears that historically the epithet "Orthodox" distinguished all those Christians who were faithful to the Council of Chalcedon,¹ and it can be freely applied to these Eastern dissidents without begging any questions.

¹ See Père de la Taille in *Orientalia Christiana*, Vol. V, No. 21, February, 1926, p. 281. Latterly, monophysite Copts, Jacobites, and others, have taken to adding "Orthodox" to their names, which is confusing.

The Orthodox Church is a federation of a score of separate Orthodox Churches, and the process of history has been such that these bodies have practically all developed into *national* units, each one self-governing and independent of the others. Their principle of unity (apart from ecumenical councils, which they have not attended or recognized or attempted to summon since the schism) is purely internal, they have no external or juridical bond corresponding to the Supreme Pontificate in the Catholic Church: it is, therefore, extremely remarkable that they have retained so much unity as in fact they display. This unity of faith, morals and worship is undoubtedly due in some measure to lack of precision in definition and to a willingness to differ; in theory the unity is complete, in fact it is a substantial agreement which today shows some tendency to weaken (there are currents of opinion trickling towards Rome, towards Protestantism, towards Modernism), and the weakening is due not a little to the close association of many of the Churches with the civil power. On the other hand, the fundamental internal solidarity of Orthodoxy, underneath what often appear alarming quarrels and party differences, must not be underestimated. Moreover, what is frequently called the Erastianism of the Orthodox Churches must be looked at in its historical setting. Imperial Constantinople set the example: the Emperor was a quasi-sacramental being, regarded as the vicegerent of God on earth in a way that the Patriarch never was (the Popes in the Middle Ages tried, and failed, to bring about an analagous position in the West, with the Holy Roman Emperor in subordination to the Church); in Russia an imperial despot, Peter the Great, riveted chains of civil control on the Church; and in the Balkans during centuries of Turkish oppression the Church was the only corporate expression of national life and aspiration, so that it is not surprising that when freedom came to Greece and Rumania and Serbia and Bulgaria there was a connection between Church and State so close as to be bad for both.

Nor must the attitude of Orthodoxy towards nationalism be misunderstood. Historically it has developed into a number of independent Churches on a national basis, and religio-national tension is often acute; but in principle the "Rumanian Church," for example, is simply the Orthodox

Church in Rumania, just as the "French Church" is the Catholic Church in France. That the branches of the Church are today in the main national is a result of the process of secular history and politics, and the position is greatly aggravated by chauvinistic governments.

On the other hand, it cannot be disguised that the Orthodox Churches from time to time lend themselves to the use of the State for national and political ends;² "Hellenization," "Russification," "Serbianizing" are constantly cropping up in their history and, especially among the Greeks, sometimes for the purposes of ecclesiastical aggrandizement.

Relations Between the Churches. The various Orthodox Churches are the *Patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, Moscow, Yugoslavia, and Rumania*; the *Katholike of Georgia*; the *Exarchate of Bulgaria*; and the *Churches of Cyprus, Sinai, Greece, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Finland, Poland, Latvia, and Lithuania*.³

Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem are still often referred to as the *Melkite Churches*.⁴ The *Greek Churches* are those of Constantinople, Greece and Cyprus, and, in a measure, Alexandria, Jerusalem and Sinai. The *Slav group* consists of Russia, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Poland and Czechoslovakia. These Churches can also be divided theoretically into *autocephalous* and *autonomous*: an autocephalous Church is one subject to no outside jurisdiction whatsoever, while an autonomous Church, though self-governing, is still under the limited authority of a patriarch or other hierarch outside itself. But these last are tending to disappear. The ordinary relations between the different Churches are slight; whenever a new chief bishop is appointed he informs the heads of the other Churches by means of a "letter of peace," and that is about all. But of recent years extraordinary relations have become more and more frequent and the chief

² This is not unknown in "the West," but Catholic authorities less easily lend themselves to the policies of the civil power. French missionaries have been notorious for "frenchifying"—but then they sincerely believe that the best thing that can happen to the representative of some ancient non-European civilization is to become "French." On this see the Archbishop of Westminster, "White Against Black in Africa," in *The Month*, October, 1935.

³ A summary account of Eastern Christendom may be found in the writer's *The Eastern Churches* (C. T. S.), and fuller particulars in his *The Dissident Eastern Churches*, shortly to be published by Bruce, Milwaukee (Coldwell, London).

⁴ C.J. "The Catholics of Galilee," by Edward Bowron, *The Month*, January, 1937.

Churches are in increasingly close touch with one another.

It is a common idea in the West that the Patriarch of Constantinople, who calls himself "The Ecumenical Patriarch," is as it were the Pope of the Orthodox Church. This is quite erroneous. There have indeed been patriarchs since the schism who wanted to attain for their See an analagous position to that of the Bishop of Rome, and there were moments when they nearly succeeded;⁵ but in the past hundred years the territorial extent of the patriarchate has been reduced to a shadow and its more bizarre ambitions have disappeared with its powers. These powers have always fluctuated, and the theoretical and actual relationship of Constantinople with the other Orthodox Churches is a long and extremely complex chapter in ecclesiastical history. But to-day the practical position is plain: the Patriarch of Constantinople has a primacy of honor only, and enjoys a certain unique prestige among Orthodox Christians throughout the world. For the rest, no Orthodox Church takes any important decision without informing the Ecumenical Patriarch of it, and some of them still apply to him for the holy chrism. Nor must every excursion of that Patriarch outside his own territory be set down as a tendentious interference; for there is no doubt that the protothrone of Orthodoxy has properly a general solicitude for all the Churches and the duty to watch over and help them when they are in difficulties. To that protothrone belongs the right to convene a General Council of those Churches, a gathering which many Orthodox have been demanding for a very long time; but all efforts to convene such a Council have so far proved fruitless.

It is not surprising that the need for a limited central authority of some sort, or at least a clearing-house for business affecting all the Orthodox Churches, is keenly realized by some, and in 1935 the Rumanian Patriarch Miron and the Serbian Patriarch Barnabas suggested the establishment at Constantinople of a permanent synod of representatives of all the Churches. The suggestion was well received in most places except Greece (where it was viewed

⁵ When the Tsar Alexis, in 1663, asked *inter alia* whether Constantinople was the final court of appeal for all the Orthodox Churches, Dionysius III and the other three Patriarchs made a significant admission: "Before the Universal Church was rent by papal pride and ill will," they said, "this privilege belonged to the Pope of Rome. Since then it belongs to the throne of Constantinople."

as a covert advance against the Hellenism of the proto-throne), but it was refused by Constantinople; there the Greek view was shared, and it was feared that such a permanent synod would mean the final extinction of what little remains of the authority of the Ecumenical Patriarch.

The Hierarchy. All Orthodox patriarchs and other primates govern their Churches by means of an assembly of bishops called the Holy Synod, and the primate now tends more and more to be merely the president of this synod, without room for personal initiative; moreover, the civil power is often represented at meetings of the synod and so hampers and seeks to control its free activities. Church property, whether national, diocesan, or parochial, is usually administered by mixed or entirely lay councils or even by Government officials.

In the Byzantine hierarchy an archbishop was at the head of a series of metropolitan provinces, whose hierarchs were called metropolitans and were equivalent to Western archbishops. But "archbishop" has long been an almost purely honorary title; and though metropolitans are numerous, metropolitan provinces are gradually disappearing and all dioceses (eparchies) are being reduced to one level, their bishops subject immediately to the chief hierarch and his synod.⁶ The bishop is normally assisted by two councils, a clerical one for spirituals and a mixed one for temporals; chapters of canons are a purely Western institution, unknown to the East.⁷

Parishes also are administered by one or more councils (*ephory, epitropy*) for temporal affairs, of which the parish priest is not necessarily a member. The priest is chosen sometimes by the ephory, sometimes by the parishioners at large, but he has to be approved and appointed by the bishop.

Episcopal visitations are rare events in most countries (the priest is the minister of Confirmation), as are diocesan and provincial synods, but occasionally the bishops of a country meet in council apart from the regular Holy Synod. Among the dignitaries of the Orthodox Church there are archdeacons, archpriests, titular archimandrites, exarchs and chorepiskopoi.

⁶ In Russia archbishops rank below metropolitans.

⁷ Except in some Catholic Byzantine churches.

Although all Orthodox bishops are technically monks, many of them have never led the monastic life: the requirement means in practice that the bishop must be single or a widower and have been invested with the monastic habit before his consecration. Moreover, some so-called monasteries have no specifically monastic life but are bishops' residences or other establishments having an administrative staff of monks attached.

The Orthodox Today. It is difficult to do more than generalize roughly about the spiritual state of so large and widely spread a body as the Orthodox. A majority of the clergy, miserably underpaid, still get only a minimum education and training and, at least in rural districts, are rarely called on to preach or give religious instruction (that is the schoolmaster's job, when there is one). The authorities (which include men of wide learning and deep spirituality) deplore and seek to remedy this state of affairs. In Greece the sacerdotal standard is steadily rising, and this improvement is yet more marked in Rumania. Nevertheless, there is still very much ground to be made up in these matters.

To the observer from outside it appears that the religion to which the majority are so attached is a matter of exterior observances, and that these do not include frequent reception of the sacraments. But this is to lose sight of the undoubted interior spirituality of which these observances are both a cause and an effect, and of the fact that the people identify themselves with the celebration of the Liturgy in a way that is unknown in the West. The lack of proper instruction inevitably encourages superstition and, while great importance is attached to churchgoing and most rigorous fasting, immorality in general may, often from ignorance, too easily prevail beneath an aspect of piety. But this is only to say that people are human beings; to fail one's religious principles is not a peculiarity confined to the Orthodox. In most Orthodox Churches the higher clergy are handicapped by their too close dependence on the Government; the Church becomes a political instrument and their election to offices is decided by party interests. But there is never wanting at the very least a leaven of noble spirits, conscious of abuses and failings and urgent to remedy them for the glory of God and the salvation of the children of Jesus Christ.

It is sometimes made a matter of reproach to the Orthodox that in modern times they have done no missionary work among the heathen (except the Russians, heavily subsidized by the Imperial Government for political ends). The reason is easily found in the fact that up to one hundred years ago most of the Orthodox Churches were being tyrannized over by the Ottoman Turks, and were themselves continually subject to Mohemmedan propaganda and pressure; since then it has been as much as they could do to reorganize themselves and maintain their Christianity in a world that is increasingly materialistic and secularized. Moreover, the Orthodox countries have no colonies—the first and easiest field for missionary enterprise in modern terms, and to venture into the “spheres of influence” of other Powers is to court political and international complications and sometimes religious disasters.

A matter of great concern to some of the Orthodox Churches is the spread of Freemasonry, especially in the Near East. The Orthodox Congress at Mount Athos in 1930 characterized Freemasonry as a “wicked and un-Christian organization,” and in 1932 the position in Greece was such that the Holy Synod took action and issued a formal condemnation of Freemasonry. In the same year the Russian bishops at Karlovtsy approved the condemnation pronounced at Mount Athos.

The political liberation of the Balkan States during the nineteenth century led to an inflow of Western political ideas, especially those of the anti-clerical, Masonic, and liberal French republicans. Until the Great War, the Orthodox Churches were rigidly controlled and even oppressed by politicians, brought up in this French anti-clerical school, who believed that every form of organized Christianity must be reactionary and a danger to the sovereignty of the State. It was fashionable, too, among the educated to despise the Church, which was regarded as belonging more to the Byzantine past than to the European future of their national history. But the bulk of the population was faithful to Orthodoxy. After the War, however, Western industrial civilization penetrated more and more into the Balkans, its inevitable accompaniments of Communism and godlessness spread among town workers and peasants, and old-fashioned liberalism lost its hold. The various Churches

all show an earnest, if puzzled, determination to master the new situation.

Dr. Kidd sums up the characteristics of Orthodoxy thus: "... in doctrine its system is traditional, with little room for development; in government, it holds together by a loose administrative system and so contrasts with the more centralized organization of the Roman Catholic Church; and in worship, it gives little scope for preaching, and so ignores what is all in all to the Protestant sects. In one word, the Orthodox Church, in its general aspect, is more than anything else a society for worship."⁸ That is not to say, as is commonly supposed in the West, that Orthodoxy is "stiff with gold and gorgeous with ceremonial," and no more: one more example of alleged Oriental formalism, stagnation and unchangingness. It has a living hold on large numbers of people and of late years has begun to exercise considerable influence outside the ranks of its own faithful.

Relations with the West. The attitude of the Orthodox to the Catholic Church and the reunion of Christendom is not the subject of this article, but an historical note may be given here of the reception accorded to Pope Pius IX's invitation to the Orthodox bishops to participate in the Vatican Council. By an unfortunate error the text of the invitation was printed in the *Journal de Rome* before it was delivered to the Bishops, and the comments on it both of the Catholic and Orthodox press were of such a nature as to give a fair pretext for refusal on the part of those to whom it was addressed.

The Patriarch of Constantinople, Anthimos VI, handed back the letter to Dom (afterwards Cardinal) John Pitra, O.S.B., without even reading it, declaring that attendance at the Council would be useless in the circumstances. The Patriarch of Alexandria was ill and Monsignor Ciurcia tendered the invitation to the archimandrite Neilos, who refused to receive it. "If," he said, "His Holiness had written personally to the Patriarch, and not published his letter first in the press, His Beatitude would have been happy to consider it." The Patriarch of Antioch, Monsignor Jekotheos, received the letter with signs of the deepest respect from Father Zacharias, O.S.F.C. Later in the day he returned it by the hand of a bishop, with the message that the Patriarch

⁸ *The Churches of Eastern Christendom*, p. 471.

must first consult his other bishops: nothing more was heard of it. The invitation was also returned by the Patriarch of Jerusalem to the two Canons who brought it: he could not accept it, he said, because his fellows had not done so; but, he added, "I pray always for union; may the Holy Spirit be with the Council. May God bless you."

All the other Orthodox bishops who are recorded to have replied to the invitation refused it, mostly on the ground that they could not act differently from the patriarchs; and all complained that the Holy See had arranged the Council without consulting the Orthodox East. At the same time there were among the Bishops of the Patriarchate of Antioch and the Church of Cyprus strong expressions of desire for reunion and of regret that the patriarchs had acted as they had.⁹

Pope Pius IX's letter *In suprema Petri* (1848), addressed primarily to Eastern Catholics, had given great offense to the Orthodox. Then, in 1894, on the occasion of his episcopal jubilee, Leo XIII in the Encyclical *Præclara gratulationis* issued an appeal to them direct to return to Catholic communion; it was expressed in the most courteous and gentle terms, free from all harsh words and controversial allusions, kind, fatherly and loving. It drew from Anthimos VII, Patriarch of Constantinople, and twelve of his bishops, an incredibly offensive reply, openly rude and abusive. This was answered unofficially and well by Father Maximos Malatakis, a Greek Catholic of the Byzantine rite.

In our own day we see much better things and a greatly improved spirit on both sides: Orthodox clergy and laymen attend reunion Congresses, such as those at Velehrad in Czechoslovakia,¹⁰ their clerical students are found in Catholic universities, and more, both Orthodox and Catholics realize the need to study each other's beliefs and point of view and not to be misled by prejudice or unhistorical fables.

On the other hand, it is well known that of late years official relations between some of the Orthodox Churches and the Church of England have been exceedingly amiable, the archpriest Bulgakov says on the subject of Anglican

⁹ If the Pope's invitation ever reached the Russian bishops the Imperial Government saw to it that they did not reply.

¹⁰ Official representatives of the Ecumenical Patriarch, of the Bulgarian Church, and of the Armenian Church took part in a reunion conference at Constantinople in 1930.

orders that their validity or invalidity is "a canonical and not a dogmatic question, which can be decided for the Orthodox Church [*i. e.*, the whole Church] only by a competent ecclesiastical authority." He sums up in a sentence the much-misunderstood attitude of the Orthodox towards the interconfessional, "pan-Christian" movement (Lausanne, Stockholm, Edinburgh): "The participation of Orthodoxy in this movement does not at all signify that it can renounce any part whatever of its tradition, that it can accept a compromise or reconsideration. . . . Orthodoxy is present at such conferences to testify to the truth."¹¹

¹¹ Not as characteristic but as indicative of the misunderstandings in some sections of Orthodox opinion I may quote the comment of the Bucharest *Glasul Monahilor* on the official visit of Anglican clergy to Rumania: "We are delighted that these Protestants wish to return to Orthodoxy!" In an issue of *Pantainos* in 1921, the archimandrite Chrysostom Papadopoulos (now Archbishop of Athens) wrote an article on the history of the Church in England that was simply grotesque; unhappily, equally grotesque things have been written by Catholics about the Orthodox Church.

According to *Jesuit Missions* for September, some Catholic Eskimos paddled over to Siberia one day and asked a few questions of the Siberian Chief.

"Who made you?"

And the answer came immediately:

"Stalin made me."

"And who made the world?"

"Stalin."

"And who made the sun and the moon and the stars?"

"Stalin."

"And who made the big whales?"

"Stalin. Stalin made all things, and he takes care of us in everything."

Our Eskimo then asked a simple question:

"Did your grandfathers have whales and fish and seals?"

"Of course," came the answer.

"Well, how old is Stalin?"

"Oh, about forty-five."

"Well, then," came the triumphant answer, "who made the whales and the fish and the seals before Stalin came into the world?"

That last was too much for the Chief and he beat a hasty retreat.

The interesting thing is that the Chief is said to receive a handsome salary to teach his people the almighty power of Stalin and of the Soviet State.